



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/886,895	06/21/2001	Carl N. Baron	NOR/1006	6116
37172	7590	09/21/2005	EXAMINER	
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, LLP (NORDSON) 2700 CAREW TOWER 441 VINE STREET CINCINNATI, OH 45202			OSMAN, RAMY M	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2157

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/886,895	BARON, CARL N.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ramy M. Osman	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-7 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-7 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This communication is responsive to the amendment filed on July 21, 2005, where applicant amended claims 1 and 5. Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 7/21/2005 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The rejections cited are as stated below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-3 and 5-7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Papadopoulos et al (US Patent No 6,282,454) in view of Baker et al (US Patent No 5,696,898).**

5. In reference to claims 1 and 5, Papadopoulos in view of Baker teaches a method of regulating network access to selected functions of a controller of a machine, comprising:

Coupling a controller of a machine to a network having a web server configured to publish a plurality of web screens configured to control the selected functions of the controller, the controller being operatively coupled to and independent of the web server (Abstract, column 2 lines 33-60, column 3 line 47 – column 4 line 6 and column 4 lines 20-45);

Publishing web screens on the network via the web server for receipt by at least one remote computer coupled to the web server via the network (column 2 lines 33-60, column 3 line 47 – column 4 line 6 and column 4 lines 20-45);

Although Papadopoulos teaches secure user access and authorizing user access (column 4 lines 12-20 and column 9 lines 55-65), he fails to explicitly teach identifying a network address of a user accessing the web server via the network; and restricting access of the user to selected published web screens of the plurality of web screens published by the web server based upon the identified address of the user. However Baker teaches an access control method that restricts specific users of accessing the a computer system. Baker discloses identifying a network address of a user accessing the web server via the network (column 1 lines 43-50 & 56-67, column 3 lines 38-52, column 4 lines 14-40, and claim 1); and restricting access of the user to selected published web screens of the plurality of web screens published by the web server based upon the identified address of the user (Summary, column 3 lines 38,39 & 50-52, column 3 line 64 – column 4 line 5, column 4 lines 14-35 and column 5 lines 6-15 & 25-50).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Papadopoulos by identifying a network address of a user accessing the web server via the network; and restricting access of the user to selected published web screens of the plurality of web screens published by the web server based upon the identified address of the user as per the teachings of Baker for the

Art Unit: 2157

purpose of an access control method that restricts specific users of accessing the a computer system.

6. In reference to claims 2 and 6, Papadopoulos in view of Baker teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein a user accessing the web server via the at least one remote computer is restricted in access to a subset of the plurality of published web screens (Baker: Summary, column 3 line 64 – column4 line 5, column 4 lines 14-35 and column 5 lines 6-15 & 25-50).

7. In reference to claims 3 and 7, Papadopoulos in view of Baker teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein a user accessing the web server via the web server is unrestricted in access to the plurality of published web screens (Baker: Summary, column 3 line 64 – column4 line 5, column 5 lines 6-15).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramy M. Osman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4008. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2157

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RMO
September 16, 2005



Ariol Etienne
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER